DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 770 EA 004 391

AUTHOR Nyquist, Ewald B.
TITLE Education's Financial Dilemma: Planning for Change or Reacting to Crisis.
PUB DATE 17 May 72
NOTE 32p.; Speech given before Education Commission of the States annual meeting. (6th, Los Angeles, California, May 17, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; Court Role; Courts; Educational Change; *Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Equal Education; Federal Aid; Higher Education; Private Schools; Public Schools; *School Role; Speeches; State Aid
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Reform

ABSTRACT

This speech outlines the transformation of traditional educational functions and emphasizes that establishing clear educational purposes, goals, and priorities and planning for reform and change are needs equally imperative as financial needs. The author suggests reforms for the socialization and the basic educational functions of schools, discusses ways of financing higher education, suggests such reforms for higher education as that of shortening the time required to obtain baccalaureate and professional degrees, and calls for greater interinstitutional cooperation. The author also discusses the implications of the Serrano vs. Priest equal educational opportunity case and suggests that educators, as well as State and local government officials, should take the initiative for school reform away from the courts. The speech concludes on the note that a national reappraisal of education and of the roles of the schools and colleges is in order. (JF)

ED 064770

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATION'S FINANCIAL DILEMMA:

PLANNING FOR CHANGE OR REACTING TO CRISIS

Ewald B. Nyquist
President of The University of the State of New York
and Commissioner of Education
State Education Department
Albany, New York

EA 004 391

NOTE: The attached remarks were made as the keynote address at the 6th Annual Meeting of the Education Commission of the States held on May 17, 1972, Los Angeles, California.

EDUCATION'S FINANCIAL DILEMMA:

PLANNING FOR CHANGE OR REACTING TO CRISIS

Your Excellency, Governor Scott, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Wendell Pierce, in inviting me to speak today, said that I had been chosen because I was the only person he knew who could meet every issue with an open mouth, and who could speak more clearly than he thinks.

Usually keynote speakers are asked to be (a) brief, (b) entertaining, and (c) provocative, the usual specifications which are rarely fulfilled. This time Wendell Pierce happily asked me to be (a) long-winded, (b) depressing, and (c) dull. I shall follow his instructions.

Well, there's no doubt about it, never have so many institutions felt the fiscal pain they do now. Education is no longer a money-splendored thing. There is among legislative bodies a mutiny of the bountiful, and the taxpayers are trying to find a cheaper way of making educational history.

Fiscal fitness is the curriculum everywhere. The biggest problem for education at all levels is the restoration of the confidence of the people in our education and in our institutions. Are we not strangers in paradox: The more successful we are, the more good we do, the more numbers we educate -- the more criticism we receive and the more unloving our critics become. Nyquist's Third Law of Inverse Reciprocity is: Never leave any good turn unstoned. In these days of liberated rhetoric, love seems to be

the only really taboo four-letter word and everybody seems to go to bed angry at night. If Moses came down from Mt. Sinai today, the two tablets he would be carrying would probably be aspirin. I know in New York I am often reminded of H. L. Mencken's definition of a Puritan: He is a person who has a sinking feeling that somebody, somewhere is having some fun.

There is another aspect to this paradox. Our society's belief in the value of education, as measured by any of many yardsticks, remains stronger than ever. The general belief persists that it is better to be informed than ignorant, that society's problems can best be solved through enlightened discourse, and that the satisfaction of each individual's quest for knowledge and understanding and the desire to learn to his fullest capacity, are basic values of our society.

I continue to believe, as I am sure you do, that the key to dispelling the clouds and the storms, is education and a more enlightened society. I refuse to believe that the more people know, the less they are able to solve their problems, or the less they will come to value and support education, or the less able they will be to live sensitive, creative and humane lives. Education is our shelter.

But there are valid criticisms of our schools and colleges. We are not infallible after all, nor, let us not forget, do we have all the resources we need to do the job expected of us. One of our troubles is that we have oversold education and that expectations for education have outrun resources.

And we have often raised expectations too high and promised too much as to what education could do. Poverty, prejudice, pollution, inequality, and social injustice still exist. Yet, whether we are a public or private enterprise, we must expect continuing warm interest, close public scrutiny, and extended debate. Having said these things, I am far from satisfied that the public has acknowledged or even understands the impressive record of accomplishment that our schools and colleges have compiled, especially in the last fifteen years. I shall not recount that record here, but I am convinced that the significance of our achievements continues to be smeared over.

Moreover, whenever I hear charges of sybaritic splendor in the educational community, meaning that the spartan simplicities have been overlooked, I recall with ease the inefficiencies of Penn Central, the trials and tribulations of ITT, the alarming overruns by industry in contracts with the Department of Defense, not to mention the continuing inefficiencies of the Wall Street brokerage firms, the U.S. Postal Service, and some public utility firms which shall go nameless. These things do not absolve us -- but let's begin by lowering some voices, and, above all, let's be fair.

I sometimes remember, in explanation of this penchant for criticism in our society, what that gifted book reviewer of the New York Times, Anatole Broyard, wrote not long ago:

> Though the people of the United States have probably played a greater part in determining the quality of life in their country than the people of any other major nation, they have always

> seemed more dissatisfied with their lot than most. Perhaps they found it too "homemade": Because they designed it themselves, it rarely exceeded their imaginations. Precisely what it has lacked in their eyes has been lost in the proliferation of complaints that has played such a large part in our literature. Sometimes it seems that we might have been happier if we had once had an aristocracy to blame everything on--one that could have bequeathed us its sense of style, its vices and the monuments of a more grandiose history.

There are educators who vigorously assert that money, that universal lubricant and sovereign remedy, is not all that education needs, but it is well ahead of whatever else is in second place. I think the general thesis of my remarks is that formulating clear educational purpose and goals, the establishment of priorities, and planning for reform and change are not in distant second place.

First, let me address myself to the question of the relationship of finance to the total educational enterprise. To what extent is our current dilemma a financial one?

My answer is that the financial issue is a symptom of a much more fundamental issue which has to do with purposes of education in our society. Let me tell you why I believe that <u>that</u>, rather than financing, is the fundamental issue.

First, although America is going through a period of severe financial adjustment, it is the case that we can afford those new things that we the people consider important. At the moment it seems that we consider more important those things that we can purchase in our private capacity, such

as automobiles, snowmobiles and travel, and less important those things that we purchase in our social capacity, such as health services, clean air, and education. In other words, our fiscal dilemma stems not from an absolute lack of resources that might be used for education, but from an unwillingness on the part of the American public to pay as much for education as we in education had been saying they must, if they want more and better of what we have been providing in the past.

I have chosen these words carefully. I believe that I am safe in saying that almost nowhere have parents or taxpayers asked us to run our schools and colleges on less dollars than they have had in the past. What they have been resisting is giving us more dollars. Of course, with rising costs, the same dollars will buy less program, so that, in effect, being asked to get along with what we have is being asked to do less. But I wonder how much the average citizen and taxpayer sees it that way. I wonder if he is not saying to us: "If all you can do is what you have been doing, I am willing to pay for that as I have in the past. But I am not convinced that I want to buy still more of what I have been getting. The extra dollars that you educators have been getting recently don't seem to be buying as much value as the dollars that you got to build up our present system. If you cannot show me that I am going to get something more for my dollars than riots, drugs, dropouts, and discontent, then I am not going to give one nickel more."

If I have interpreted the message correctly, then the theme of this conference might better be: "Education's Educational Dilemma."

A second factor that has created the appearance of a financial dilemma has to do with the forces that have driven up the cost of education.

If education has been seeking more and more money year after year, it has done so no more than other public and private service activities which are labor intensive in their operations. There are several simple, direct and sound reasons why the total expenditures on education at all levels and the cost per student have risen sharply over the past 20 years. In 1940 we had ten million children under five years of age; by 1960 we had twice that number. Children have moved in great tidal waves through the entire educational system. Hence, the sheer growth and size of the educational establishment and its operation have accounted for inevitable increases in total expenditure.

Along with the increase in total school age population, we have also seen a continuous rise in the average number of years of schooling completed, more specifically, in the proportion of students who are completing high school and, in turn, in the percentage of high school graduates enrolling in post-secondary institutions.

Two other factors have weighed heavily in accelerating the increase in total, unit, and relative costs of education. General inflation has been with us since the end of World War II, and it has increased in intensity in the past few years. Secondly, even in the absence of general inflation, the cost of educational services would have risen and has risen relative to the

costs of manufactured goods which are subject to productivity improvements through the processes of invention, engineering, and technical change. Education is a service activity; its principal resource is manpower; its process is person to person; and, in spite of the development and availability of new media and techniques for the delivery of education services, the system of producing and delivering that service, strictly in quantitative terms, has changed very little for generations. Nor is there very much difference between the delivery systems in higher education versus those in elementary and secondary schools. One can suggest, then, that even with a constant price level, the cost of a year of schooling for one child would be about five times the price of a household refrigerator or air conditioner today, as opposed to, perhaps, twice the cost of those items 20 years ago.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that education has not increased in cost any more than numerous other services which the public buys for private purposes: television and automobile repairs, plumbing and electrical services, haircuts and tailoring; and, for the sharpest case of all, health care.

Americans have been demanding and consuming greatly increased amounts of services in the past 20 years, with their total expenditure for services in 1970 being more than double the expenditure in 1960. In 1971, expenditures on services from the private sector alone exceeded, for the first year in our history, expenditure on all non-durable consumable goods.

Expenditures for services are high both because of the increasing volume of services required and because this kind of economic activity is subject only very little to productivity improvements; and this is true whether such activity is provided by public or private practitioners.

The rise in the cost of education might have been tolerable if it were not for the fact that these increased costs have had to be met largely through state and local tax systems. These systems were inadequately responsive to rising general wealth of the nation and were subjected simultaneously to competing demands from such other compelling social needs as welfare, sanitation, health, and transportation.

Thus, while state and local governmental expenditures went from $8 billion 30 years ago to $135 billion last year, Federal, civic or non-military expenditures rose only by some $16 billion.

Clearly, something must be done; and while we speak for the needs of education, we speak also for the needs of all of those services, activities and commitments which have traditionally fallen upon state and local governments. While the responsibility for and the control over most of these traditional areas can and should remain at local and state levels, the Federal government's tax capacity and powers must be shared very substantially with these governments.

But it is no longer enough to ask for money because our cause is worthy. We must show that "we are really doing as well as we should be with the money we have." We hear about the "unquenchable thirst of the

educational community for more and more money." Are we doing as well as we should? The difficulty we have in responding to that question is, I believe, that we as a people are no longer sure just what it is that formal education should be doing. In education, as in so many aspects of our national life, there is no national consensus on what the major purposes and priorities should be.

At one time it was very easy to answer that question -- the purpose of the schools was to give each person the basic skills he needed to get along in life and to give those with aspirations for further education the foundation they required. Failure to acquire the basic life skills in school did not carry too high a penalty and so the failure of the schools to teach the basic skills to some children was not an issue. Since most people did not expect to go on with formal schooling beyond high school, dropping out or failure to lay a good foundation for college, and even failure to acquire a marketable skill, were not issues.

The schools, too, had certain custodial and socializing functions, but failure to perform carried consequences that were difficult to detect.

Now things are different. Every one of the traditional functions has become an issue, and each has contributed its share to the public discontent with education.

It will repay us to look at the transformation of a couple of these traditional functions, for in them we may find the ways out of our dilemmas.

Let us first consider the transformation in the central educational function of the schools. In the days before television, motorcars and airplanes, most of what individuals learned about the world beyond their immediate experience they learned in school and from reading. School represented an opening for a world beyond the limits of one's direct experience. As James Coleman has said in a fine article in the February issue of Psychology Today: "Schools as they now exist were designed for an information-poor society," but our children live amidst "information-richness." Hence, school often seems dull, boring, something to be endured for reasons which seem never adequately to be explained.

Our teachers know this reality best of all. They know that some children come to them far more knowledgeable about many matters than they are themselves; while others, not so knowledgeable, have been turned off to the only forms of instruction that the teachers know how to use. Thus, the teacher is faced with the nearly insurmountable tasks of simultaneously trying to enrich the experience of part of the class, while seeking some new techniques that will provide minimal basic instruction for another.

The dilemma, then, is that the educational function is not really as much needed by that part of the student body that formerly was most responsive to it, and the school has not learned yet how to provide education for those who are in greatest present need of it.

For both groups we need much more intensive exploration of alternative means to provide education. Some of these will involve transformation

in methods of instruction; many will, I suspect, involve resources outside of the traditional classroom, though they may, and should, fall within the purview of the educational authorities. May I remind you that we have Commissioners and Boards of Education, not of schools. The school or college is but one among a widening array of alternatives available to us to do the job of educating.

I am thinking here of such alternatives as these:

1. Television - broadcast and cable and now video cassettes which give the learner full control of the scheduling of his instruction.

2. Computer assisted and managed instruction, particularly through home terminals.

3. Correspondence courses and other forms of independent study.

4. Libraries, museums, and other community resources, such as business, hospitals, social agencies, and government offices.

5. Special purpose learning centers, such as Early Childhood Centers or language schools.

6. Learning Centers at places of employment.

7. Finally, and not least in importance, is the family. It may be, incidentally, that the time has come to shift back to the family more responsibility for the education of children. With better educated parents and more materials available to support home instruction, we might consider the economic, as well as the social and psychological, advantages from expecting parents to teach their own children basic skills. At least we might

remind parents that the schools and especially the colleges no longer stand in loco parentis to their kids and just maybe some part of teaching values and behavior belongs to them.

We must make a mesh of things. To link all of these to our formal system, we are developing new forms of credentialing-proficiency examinations and external degrees and diplomas. We may, however, find soon that our entire concept of credentials will, itself, be transformed.

These examples are enough to suggest that we need no longer rely solely on schools to transmit information. As Coleman says, whatever the shape of future schools, they must not have as their primary goal the teaching of children. Instead, he suggests,

> The schools of the future must focus on those activities that in the past have largely been accomplished outside school: first, productive action with responsibilities that affect the welfare of others, to develop the child's ability to function as a responsible and productive adult; and second, the development of strategies for making use of the information richness and the information-processing capabilities of the environment.

Still another set of alternatives is provided by the non-public sector of education. It, too, is faced with severe financial problems and it is affected along with the public sector by the same social transformations. I would be remiss if, in this discussion, I did not speak also to the plight of the non-public schools. Recent Court decisions involving the public funding, or rather the non-public funding of non-public schools, reminds me that, while educators often have more solutions than there are problems, the Federal Courts seem to find a problem for every solution.

I firmly believe that the diversity and pluralism in educational initiatives must be maintained and that means must be found to assist in their financial support. Having said that, I am not sanguine that we can stop the decline of private schools or private higher institutions.

Take the Catholic schools: Rising costs, increasing unwillingness or inability to pay higher tuition costs; sharp reduction in lower paid teaching nuns and priests; declining parental commitment to support separate private schools; increased educational quality of public schools; some discontent with the nature of religious training; ecumenism with its increased tolerance and understanding of religious differences -- these are some factors which spell continued decline.

Alan Pifer, President of the Carnegie Corporation, recently reported on the doubts being raised about the "continued viability of our traditional system of shared responsibility between public and private endeavor." He warned that private institutions may become victims of the conflicting interests and fears of a troubled society and identified four groups who represent growing public distrust of private institutions:

Americans alienated from society because of poverty, discrimination, or disillusionment, who view such institutions as part of the status quo (which is just another Latin term for the mess we're in); conservatives who consider them too "liberal;" those who maintain a populist distrust of private institutions and associate them with wealth and privilege; and a vast number who are indifferent or unaware of what private institutions provide.

I would speculate that in the future, unless some unique program is offered or special clientele is being served, only those private schools and colleges will survive which are better and more innovative than their public counterparts.

And talking about the need for reform, many schools and colleges know that one of the most innovative agents around is the threat of going out of business.

Should we fail to find means to continue in existence a full range of private schools, it will be even more vital that we "generate alternatives within the public sector."

A second function that has been transformed and requires reform is the socializing function. There was a time when a central function of the public school was to give an immigrant and diverse population a common experience and even a common language. The task was to counter the heterogeneity and parochialism of an urban immigrant and isolated rural population. Today the situation is quite different. Television, high mobility and standardization of consumer products all conspire to make all Americans more alike. When the school persists in its traditional pursuit of this same purpose, it adds only minutely to the powerful forces pushing people to greater homogeneity. As people try to resist the pressures to put them into a common mold, they lash out, not at the point of stronger pressure, but at the weaker -- the school. Here, then, is another source

of public hostility to the schools. It is no doubt in response to this pressure that we have seen in recent years the emergence of a variety of alternative schools, each seeking to establish an identity that sets it and its students apart in visible ways from the main stream of American education and American society. It may be that in a society in which the forces working to make us alike are so powerful, the school has a vital job now of helping to preserve and promote human diversity. Harvey Scribner, the forthright Chancellor of the New York City Schools, has said that the public schools "must offer learning opportunities as widely diverse as the students who come to the school by law."

It is within this function that I place the matter of racial and social class isolation. I am sure that black children and poor children can learn without the presence of white children or richer children (although I am not convinced that schools attended exclusively by blacks or the poor will get the resources they need to provide good education). I am equally convinced that neither black children nor white children, rich children nor poor children, will learn to live together, or in a multi-racial, multi-cultured world, unless they live in the same neighborhood, or, at minimum, attend school together. Thus, the stand I have taken on busing is not exclusively based on the legal requirement of assuring blacks and similarly situated minorities equal access to educational opportunity; it is based, as well, on the educational requirements of all children, including the moral consideration

of appreciating that similarities between peoples are greater than differences, and that difference is a source of richness and value, not a thing to be feared and avoided.

Busing has long been accepted as a convenience for getting children to the schools that will best serve them. I trust that the present controversy will not deprive us of that convenience. The justification for busing has been and must remain that it results in a better experience for the youngster than if he did not use the bus.

In particular, we must accept the fact that schools located in ghetto areas are perceived and, indeed, often are, less adequate than those outside the ghetto, particularly when they are undersupported or unable to attract and hold talented staff. This should tell us that those schools must be transformed so that they become acceptable places for any child. Just as the drug problem did not attract major national attention until it began to touch the sons and daughters of the white middle class in the suburbs, so the urgent needs of inner city schools may only properly be attacked when the more influential segments of society are faced with the prospect of sending their children to them. As this situation is recognized, I feel confident that the good sense of the American people will, in time, prevail, and the road to racial harmony will again be open.

We have looked at the transformations in two key functions of education -- the educational function itself, and the socializing function. I

have argued that as these functions are transformed, the sources of our financial dilemma will be well on the way to solution.

Still another source of our dilemma is suggested by a third point in my outline of things to cover in this keynote address. The President's Commission on School Finance has asserted that "money alone, without substantial improvements and innovation in education, will not solve all school problems."

As some of you may know, that Commission funded a study by the Rand Corporation to look at the research on education, to see what research had to say about ways to achieve more effective schooling. Their conclusions were distressing. They could find no research evidence that "identified a variant of the existing system that is consistently related to students' educational outcomes." This led the Rand staff to draw two implications for educational policy:

1. Increasing expenditure on traditional educational practices is not likely to improve educational outcomes substantially.

2. There seem to be opportunities for significant redirections and, in some cases, reductions in educational expenditures without deterioration in educational outcomes.

I am sorry to say that I do not have any evidence to contest directly those two propositions. The Rand researchers were looking for research evidence that demonstrated the superiority of a practice over others. Finding none, they reached the conclusions already noted.

These conclusions do not mean that education itself does not produce results, only that the specific value of any particular educational practice cannot be demonstrated. The evidence is overwhelming on the association between education and individual and collective economic well being. We may, however, be reaching the point of marginal return on increased investment in traditional education both at the school and college levels.

What is now needed is a transformation in education, or a redesign as we call it in New York, or renewal as Commissioner Marland calls it. This means, not more money to do more and better what we have been doing, but a real effort to determine what we should be doing now and in the future. Then, as we decide the what, we need to get to work on the even tougher job of changing how we do the job.

This means that much of the transformation must and can be done with existing resources. When we have new proposals worth adopting, we must look at what can be eliminated or modified to release the money and time for the new venture. It will take some seed money to help facilitate this transformation. Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and similar programs, have taught us how to use seed money for change. We need to apply those lessons. When we do, and begin to see more of the kinds of changes that have begun, then we will be in a position to make the case for more resources. In other words, we need to reform

in order to get money, not to get money in order to reform. But, lest I be misinterpreted, let me say immediately that education needs more money now, whether reform takes place or not. My thesis is, however, that while we need more money than we have been getting, we will not get as much as we want until reform becomes more uniform.

Still another source of our fiscal dilemma stems from the fact that higher education has made an increasing claim on the private and public education dollar. And what's more, there is growing competition between the elementary and secondary level and the higher education component for the available dollar.

While we have long accepted the principle that education through secondary school is a governmental responsibility and should be paid for by the taxpayers at large, we are still in the stage of active debate over who should pay for higher education and by what means.

Our private institutions were once both academically and financially exclusive. Today, while most would prefer to retain autonomy in the matter of academic standards for admission, their tuitions are making them much more financially exclusive than they care to be.

To protect the quality and diversity of both public and private institutions, we must find a method of financing higher education that provides a level of funding adequate for the essential tasks the institutions must perform. It must be one that satisfies the public and the parents' right to know

what they are paying for, while not interfering with the essential right of institutions to determine how best to operate.

In considering support for higher education, both public and private, the key points are: (1) that there is only one thing to be financed and that is the operation of higher educational institutions, and (2) there are only two ways of providing those funds, directly to the institutions who are supplying the educational services, or through the students who are demanding the educational services. We could do it all one way or the other way, and, historically, we have done it both ways. Student aid permits the students to choose the institutions they will attend, submits those institutions to the test of the marketplace, and, in time, determines which institutions and programs will survive and continue to receive support. Student aid also tends more to let students (i.e., people) determine what and how they wish to study, to become what they wish to become.

Institutional aid, while it assists the institutions in meeting the wishes of students who bring to them their student aid and other funds, gives more decision-latitude to the institutions, and to their administrators and faculty, control which has its advantages and disadvantages, depending upon the public versus private point of view and priority being considered.

These and other aspects of the choice involved in the student aid versus the institutional aid route have implications for both the institutions and the society at large, which I leave to you to mull over. I do wish to

make one final point. Increasingly in our society, education is viewed as benefiting only or primarily the individual, not society, and that, therefore, the burden of financing his education must be shifted to the individual. This trend, unfortunately, comes at the very time when the conscience of society has been pricked, and when, accordingly, open admissions and open door policies have been adopted to aid minority and economically disadvantaged groups. I am concerned that such proposals may be indicative of a shift from grants to loans as a basis for providing assistance to students toward overcoming financial obstacles to college study.

I share the view of those who maintain that providing a higher education is primarily a public responsibility in which the public benefits as well as the student, and that the student with limited financial resources should not be made to bear the major burden himself, either on an immediate or a deferred payment basis. I believe that heavy loan obligations will not be feasible for low-income students, that those who are forced into such loans will be required to carry an undue financial burden for an extended period of time, and that the consequences may well be an accumulation of resentment, frustration, and antagonism over the years.

A concentration of concern over the financing of the present system of higher education should not shunt aside a necessary concern for changes in that system: its organization, its operational methods, its management, its programs, its commitments, and its efficiency. Broadening the sources

and the number of participants in the financing of the system will and should inevitably result in claims from the various contributors for participation in decisions over what the system does and how it does it. To date, higher institutions, both public and private, have emphasized their need for more income. They must also initiate new and continue existing means of improving productivity, reducing or at least holding down the level of costs, and adopt, more rapidly, plans for shortening the time span of degree programs and providing alternatives to conventional institutional educational programs.

I am often reminded of Robert Hutchins' famous remark. He said: "I understand Harvard University is making its diplomas larger or smaller. I have forgotten which. This is a step in the right direction."

As with elementary and secondary education, the needs are not only financial and managerial. Higher education, too, has an immense reform task ahead. Much of what I have said regarding the schools would, with little modification, apply to the colleges and universities as well. Here are some specific areas where action is needed:

1. Shortening of the time period necessary to secure degrees, including either elimination of the twelfth year of secondary school (often a lost year to many students) or merging of that year with the first year of college, so as to permit achievement of the baccalaureate in three years. A shortening also of the total undergraduate and graduate years in pursuit of professional degrees.

There is, for many students, an exceptional overlap between secondary schools and what is taught in college, amounting to at least 20 - 25 percent and running upwards to 50 percent, depending on the subject. No wonder some students are bored in college. I would expect, in any case, that 10 to 15 percent of high school graduates could clearly be as well educated at the end of three college years as they would be at the end of four, and we would have done something about shortening the period of prolonged adolescence.

2. This leads me to the need for greater use of college entrance proficiency examinations covering subject areas in which students have achieved competence, and acceptance of passing performance, not simply to exempt the student from certain college courses, but to grant him credit for those courses so that he may achieve the degree in a shorter time and so that institutional resources may be economized. Some institutions are giving such examinations to entire entering classes. The University of Utah has saved students and their parents nearly a million dollars in tuition this year in this way, and so far almost 1300 students have been able to trim a full year off the time required to earn a degree.

3. Universal mutual acceptance of transfer credits amongst all public and private higher institutions, accompanied by minimization of the often slight differences in course descriptions and content.

4. Much greater institutional cooperation on regional bases, involving more yielding of institutional autonomy, and cooperative endeavors

of real substance to economize the total use of resources and to maximize educational opportunities for students. Higher education is too much a many-splintered thing.

5. Expansion of external degree programs operated by individual institutions, by consortia of such institutions, and by state agencies. Our society has shifted to a mental base; it is knowledge dependent, and education has become a social condition. Individuals should be given credit for what they know, no matter how they have acquired it.

6. Accelerate the adoption and use by faculty of all institutions of the great variety of sophisticated instructional technology. Again, to date, the rate of utilization, even in institutions which already have the media, is distressingly low.

7. Make positive, constructive and productive use of that contact sport, collective bargaining, between faculty and institutions which is now becoming widespread. Private industry does not make concessions in salaries, fringe benefits, and conditions of work without seeking quid pro quos which bear strongly upon productivity, efficiency and innovation. Higher institutional managements should do the same. Collective bargaining contracts can be made to work in the direction of permitting greater control over costs, even as pressure exists for increasing them.

I am often reminded of the professor in Vermont who was confronted by a produce farmer. "How many hours do you teach?" asked the farmer. "Nine," said the professor. "Mighty long day," exclaimed the farmer.

8. Examination of the number, diversity, quality, and institutional location of graduate academic and professional programs on a regional, statewide and national basis.

All of these efforts, and many more, are needed if we are to achieve efficient use of resources in higher education, control and keep down costs, provide maximum opportunity to students to achieve credentials in the minimum necessary time periods, and sustain a diversified system of higher education.

The central thrust of my argument thus far has been that the source of our financial dilemma is not only money.

The roots lie in the public assessment of the value of education itself. Are we, at the local, state, and Federal levels, willing to make education as high a priority in our society as it deserves and as we seem to say we are? I know at the Federal level, so far, education does not occupy a supremely high rung in the ladder of national priorities and no amount of Federal rhetoric is going to change my mind. I can be as prejudiced as anyone else: All I need is the right subject. Under the Federal government's maxi-policies for education, it wears a mini-program. As Tallulah Bankhead once said after meeting Alexander Woollcott: There is less here than meets the eye.

In my view, Federal support up to a third of the costs of elementary and secondary education would be welcome. I shall not discuss here the

ways in which Federal funds for education can be channeled to the states. These are well known and range from general revenue sharing, take-over of welfare, reshaped and expanded block grants, or even full funding of existing programs.

Groucho Marx was recently asked: "What do you think of women's rights?" To which he replied: "I like either side of them." I like the many sides of Federal funds for education at all levels. The Federal government must be more than a junior partner in supporting education.

I know that a focus of the agenda of this meeting is on the issues of financing raised by Serrano-Priest: The many ways in which full state funding might be achieved, the issues of what happens to that minor branch of theology called local control, what happens to the peaks of excellence if you raise the valleys, the issue of whether local schools are to have local leeway in financing. I want nothing I have said to diminish the importance that I attach to achieving equity in the financing of schools. This must come, and already we see bold governors and legislators proposing solutions.

The Serrano decision has put before us one of the fundamental social issues of our time -- the balance between the value we attach to equality and the value we attach to the freedom of each parent to choose the best for his own child.

The First and Fourteenth Amendments have given us constitutional principles which have assured a vitality in American civilization, providing

as they do, a tenuous conflicting balance between the freedom of the individual and the constraints placed on that freedom by viture of the individual's obligation to his fellow man. As another chief state school officer has pointed out, this "basic healthy duality in the American democratic ethos has affected public policy." The fine creative balance between individual rights and social welfare has historically shifted in direction.

What we are now witnessing is the struggle over a dramatic new egalitarian philosophy which seems to suggest that all children shall have equal access to the best education that is being offered under public auspices. This is a shift from the past view of equality which sought only to assure equal opportunity of access to a minimum level of education.

Now we seem to be moving to a position that holds that there is a right of every child to access to the same level of education appropriate to his needs that is available to any other child with similar needs.

A shift in the method of financing that moves us in that direction will obviously have profound impact on all of the functions that I have discussed. Clearly to achieve equality as envisioned by the courts, by leveling up, not down, will require either vast additional sums, or a vast transformation in the ways that we provide education, and maybe both. It should be clear from my preceding remarks, that I believe we must address ourselves equally to the task of transformation as to the issue of financing.

Furthermore, Serrano and the related cases represent a disturbing trend, and these are my concluding remarks. Increasingly, since the

Brown decision in 1954, the courts have been called upon to settle major issues of educational policy. Because we are unable to resolve our differences within the local, educational, or even political arenas, the courts have been forced into taking actions that reach far into the traditional spheres of education. The courts have become pioneers in educational policy-making. A Texas court has even specified a full detailed curriculum for Spanish-speaking minorities!

How did we come to the point where we seem to have relinquished our educational responsibilities to the courts? Why, with increasing frequency, has the court, and especially the Federal court, been the only institution willing to guarantee the constitutional rights of students and minority groups in cases ranging from Brown to Tinker to Serrano? Our society has been characterized as "a splendid quarrel" but one which is also a consensual society. As Samuel Goldwyn used to say: For your information, let me ask you some questions:

Have we lost, as a nation, our ability to compromise our differences locally? While we surely are a nation of law and not of men, why do we have to be so litigious? I have always thought that the courts were a last resort when human relations have failed.

Do we yet understand, especially in the schools, that in loco parentis is sharply circumscribed, that a student is now a citizen who also happens to be a student, that the constitution does not stop at the schoolhouse door?

As a recent court remarked: "The school has not quietly or voluntarily yielded up its enormous power over the lives of its students." And went on to say: The buck-passing to the courts for decision-making has "Engendered fear and resentment among parents, teachers, and all levels of the school hierarchy and has provided school officials with a convenient scapegoat on which to blame their own deficiencies."

Have we lost sight of the need for humaneness in our schools and colleges, of the fact that the individual is still the basic unit of value in our society, of our educational mission to turn out individuals who can live sensitive, creative, humane lives?

Have we lost the zest for experiment and reform and innovation upon which this country was founded, for, surely, self-generated reform anticipates what the courts would otherwise mandate?

Has local control meant that we have often been blind to its failures? Has not local control, too often, meant the denial of equal treatment to those in the community too powerless to demand what should have been accorded? Has it not meant segregated schools within districts and the erection between districts of barriers that perpetuate racial, social and economic isolation? Too often we have relinquished moral leadership to the courts instead of speaking first when justice needs a voice.

Do we understand in the schools that present generations are biologically and intellectually more mature, by one or two years, than

generations 30 to 40 years ago, and that we need to make adjustments in our treatment of them?

Are we, as a nation, yet committed philosophically and legally to social and educational openness which would make us less dependent upon the courts? I think there is a challenge here to legislators, governors, and educators to accept greater responsibility to make the difficult, but necessary, educational decisions to bring about educational justice, complete access to equal educational opportunity for all children, rather than to relinquish those responsibilities to the courts, courts which have been more innovative and progressive than we have been.

Is it not time that we who are concerned with educational policy take back the initiative from the courts? To be sure, we shall have to face and resolve some tough issues, but if we do not have the strength and courage to endure the pain of reform, can courts really supply our deficiency? I doubt it. Judge Learned Hand once said: "I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes. Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; . . . While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it."

We need to start by stepping back from the press of day-to-day operations and current crises and take a good, hard, look at what we want this

education enterprise of ours to do. I am suggesting a national reappraisal of education and the roles of the schools and colleges. Which educational tasks do we want the schools and colleges to perform? Which might be better left or assigned to other social agencies? Basically, we need to determine what people expect and are willing to pay for and what standards of performance they expect the schools and colleges to achieve. We, in New York State, have begun such reappraisal at state, intermediate and local levels in a project we call Redesign. Other states have similar efforts under way. It is based on planning and anticipating the future, the establishment of purpose and priorities. I can think of no more fitting task for the Education Commission of the States to undertake than to lead the entire nation in a major national reappraisal. This meeting itself could provide the take-off. You have the opportunity here to define the issues and lay out at least some of the alternatives that ought to be the subject of national examination.

I pose to you, as you enter your deliberations here these next few days, this challenge to leadership.

EBN 5/17/72